arXiv:1604.03415v1 [math.GR] 11 Apr 2016

HYPERGROUPS AND HYPERFIELDS IN UNIVERSAL ALGEBRA

LOUIS ROWEN

Abstract. Hypergroups are lifted to power semigroups with negation, yielding a method of transferring results from semigroup theory. This applies to analogous structures such as hypergroups, hyperfields, and hypermodules, and permits us to transfer the general theory espoused in [19] to the hypertheory.

1. Introduction

This note, a companion to [19], grew out of a conversation with Matt Baker, in which we realized that the "tropical hyperfield" of [3] and [22, §5.2] is isomorphic to the "extended" tropical arithmetic in Izhakian's Ph.D. dissertation (Tel-Aviv University) in 2005, also cf. [10, 11]. On the other hand, there are many parallels between the two theories. This motivated us to see whether hyperfields in general also can be studied by semiring theory, which fits in well with the theory of universal algebra, and which might be more amenable for further study. Viewing a hyperfield as a group with additive structure on part of its power set, we want to extend this structure to all of the power set, thereby making the definitions tighter and "improving" the additive structure to make standard tools more available for developing an algebraic theory.

Thus, the theme is to embed the category of hyperfields (and their modules) into the category of semirings with negation (and their modules), as studied in [19], defined on power sets. The tricky part in passing to the power set is distributivity, which must be weakened at times to a notion that we call "weak distributivity," and we thereby weaken "semiring" to "$\mathcal{T}$-semiring," where distributivity holds only with respect to a special subset $\mathcal{T}$. Then we can treat all hyperrings (not just hyperfields) in this context.

It turns out that the hyperrings of [3, 22] can be injected naturally into $\mathcal{T}$-semirings, which are power sets with a negation map, in the context of [19], whereby the hyperring is identified with the subset of singletons. Then one can develop linear algebra over hyperfields, and also go through [3], making the appropriate adjustments to view matroids over these semifields with negation.

In the other direction, Henry [9] has defined a hypergroup structure on symmetrized monoids.

1.1. Pre-semirings.

Semigroups need not have an identity element, but monoids do, and are usually written multiplicatively, i.e. $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$. We start with semirings, for which the standard reference is [7]. Since distributivity will be weakened, we remove it (as well as the element $\mathbb{0}$) from the definition. We enrich a monoid with a "hyper" operation (resembling addition).

Definition 1.1. *A monoid $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$ **acts** on a set $\mathcal{S}$ if there is a multiplication $A \times \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $\mathbb{1}s = s$ and $(a_1a_2)s = a_1(a_2s)$ for all $a_i \in A$ and $s \in S$.*

*A **pre-semiring** $(A, \cdot, +, \mathbb{1})$ is a multiplicative monoid $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1}_R)$ also possessing the structure of an additive Abelian semigroup $(A, +)$, on which $(A, \cdot)$ acts.*

*A **pre-semifield** is a pre-semiring $(A, \cdot, +, \mathbb{1})$ for which $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$ is a group.*

*A **premodule** $\mathcal{S}$ over a monoid $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$ is an Abelian group $(\mathcal{S}, +, \mathbb{0})$ on which A acts, also satisfying the condition:*

$$r\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}} = \mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}}, \ \forall r \in R.$$

Date: April 13, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16Y60, 12K10, 06F05, 14T05 Secondary 12K10, .

Key words and phrases. hyperfield, negation map, tropical algebra, tropical geometry, power set, semiring, supertropical algebra.

*A **premodule** $\mathcal{S}$ over a pre-semiring $(A, \cdot, +, \mathbb{1})$ is a premodule over the monoid $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$, also satisfying the condition:*

- *"Left distributivity":* $(a_1 + a_2)s = a_1 s + a_2 s$, $\forall a_i \in A$, $\forall s \in S$.

Then a semiring[†] $(R, +, \cdot, \mathbb{1}_R)$ (without $\mathbb{0}$) would be a pre-semiring satisfying the usual distributive laws. There are various versions of distributivity that will be relevant to us later.

Definition 1.2. *Define the following notions, where $(S, +)$ is a premodule over a pre-semiring $(A, \cdot, +, \mathbb{1})$, for $a_i \in A$ and $s_j \in S$:*

(i) *"Right distributivity":* $a(s_1 + s_2) = as_1 + as_2$.
(ii) *"Two-sided distributivity": Left and right distributivity.*
(iii) *"Double distributivity":* $(a_1 + a_2)(s_1 + s_2) = a_1 s_1 + a_2 s_1 + a_1 s_2 + a_2 s_2$.
(iv) *"Generalized distributivity":*

$$\left(\sum_i a_i\right)\left(\sum_j s_j\right) = \sum_{i,j}(a_i s_j).$$

Remark 1.3. *The properties are in order of increasing formal strength although, by induction, double distributivity implies generalized distributivity.*

1.2. **Motivation: Power sets of semigroups.**

We let $\mathcal{P}(A)$ denote the power set of a set A, i.e., the set of subsets of A. The sets $\{a\}$ for $a \in A$ are called **singletons**.

Theorem 1.4.

(i) *Given a monoid $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$, we can extend its operation to $\mathcal{P}(A)$ elementwise, by putting*

$$S_1 S_2 = \{s_1 s_2 : \ s_j \in S_j\}.$$

Then $(\mathcal{P}(A), \cdot)$ also is a monoid with the identity element $\{\mathbb{1}\}$, on which A acts.

Given a semigroup $(A, +)$, we can define addition elementwise on $\mathcal{P}(A)$ by defining

$$S_1 + S_2 = \{s_1 + s_2 : \ s_j \in S_j\}.$$

Then $(\mathcal{P}(A), +)$ also is a semigroup.

Thus, when A is a pre-semiring (resp. semiring), so is $\mathcal{P}(A)$, and $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is an A-premodule via the action

$$aS = \{as : s \in S\}.$$

(ii) *More generally, the relevant concepts in universal algebra were outlined in* [19, §2.3]*, including signatures defined via operators and identical relations. We can lift operators from an $(\Omega; \mathrm{Id})$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, as follows: Given an operator $\omega_m = \omega_m(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ on $\mathcal{A}$, we define ω_m on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ via*

$$\omega_m(S_1, \dots, S_m) = \{\omega_m(s_1, \dots, s_m) : s_k \in S_k,\ 1 \le k \le m\}.$$

*Let us call an identical relation $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) = \phi(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ **multilinear** if each x_i appears exactly once in the definition (via the operators). Then any multilinear identical relation holding in $\mathcal{A}$ also holds in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. (i) First we verify associativity:

$$\begin{aligned}(S_1 + S_2) + S_3 &= \{a_1 + a_2 : a_j \in S_j\} + S_3 \\ &= \{(a_1 + a_2) + a_3 : a_j \in S_j\} \\ &= \{a_1 + (a_2 + a_3) : a_j \in S_j\} \\ &= S_1 + \{a_2 + a_3 : a_j \in S_j\} \\ &= S_1 + (S_2 + S_3).\end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

For generalized distributivity we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum S_i \sum T_j &= \left\{ \sum_{i_k} \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} a_{i_k} : a_{i_k} \in S_i \right\} \left\{ \sum_{j_\ell} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_j} b_{j_\ell} : b_{j_\ell} \in T_j \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \sum_{i,j,k,\ell} a_{i_k} b_{j_\ell} : a_{i_k} \in S_i,\ b_{j_\ell} \in T_j \right\} = \sum S_i T_j. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

(ii) We generalize the proof in (i). By an easy induction applied to [19, Definition 2.12], any formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ satisfies

$$\phi(S_1, \dots, S_\ell) = \{\phi(s_1, \dots, s_\ell) : s_j \in S_j\},$$

and thus any multilinear identical relation $\phi = \psi$ holding elementwise in $\mathcal{A}$ also holds set-wise in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. □

In particular, distributivity and generalized distributivity lift from a semiring A to $\mathcal{P}(A)$. When the relation is not multilinear we encounter difficulties due to repetition. For example, being a group does not lift/ Indeed, the defining identical relation $xx^{-1} = 1$ is quadratic in x; here we are defining the inverse as a unary operation $\omega_1 : x \mapsto x^{-1}$, so the left side is $x\omega_1(x)$. In fact the only invertible elements in $\mathcal{P}(A)$ are the singletons.

1.3. **Hypermonoids and semirings.**

The next step is to formulate all of our extra structure in terms of addition (and possibly other operations) on $\mathcal{P}(A)$ as a premodule over A. But this is not as easy when A itself is not a semiring, so let us pause to review hypermonoids, to see just how much of the semiring structure we would need.

The "intuitive" definition: A hypermonoid should be a triple $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ where $\boxplus : A \times A \to \mathcal{P}(A)$, and the analog of associativity holds:

$$(a_1 \boxplus a_2) \boxplus a_3 = a_1 \boxplus (a_2 \boxplus a_3), \quad \forall a \in A.$$

There is a fundamental difficulty in this definition — $a_1 \boxplus a_2$ is a set, not an element of A, so technically $(a_1 \boxplus a_2) \boxplus a_3$ is not defined. This difficulty is exacerbated when considering generalized associativity; for example, what does $(a_1 \boxplus a_2) \boxplus (a_3 \boxplus a_4)$ mean? We rectify this by passing to $\mathcal{P}(A)$.

Definition 1.5. *A **hypermonoid** is a triple $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ where*

(i) *$\boxplus$ is a commutative binary operation $A \times A \to \mathcal{P}(A)$, which also is associative in the sense that if we define*

$$a \boxplus S = \cup_{s \in S}\ a \boxplus s,$$

then $(a_1 \boxplus a_2) \boxplus a_3 = a_1 \boxplus (a_2 \boxplus a_3)$ for all a_i in A.

(ii) *$\mathbb{0}$ is the neutral element.*

We always think of $\boxplus$ as a sort of addition.

We write $\tilde{A}$ for $\{a_1 \boxplus a_2 : a_i \in A\}$. Note that $\{a\} = a \boxplus \mathbb{0} \in \tilde{A}$. Thus there is a natural embedding $A \hookrightarrow \tilde{A}$ given by $a \mapsto \{a\}$, and we can transfer the addition to $\mathcal{P}(A)$ by defining

$$\{a_1\} \boxplus \{a_2\} = a_1 \boxplus a_2.$$

By definition, the hypermonoid is not closed under repeated addition, which makes it difficult to check basic identical relations such as associativity.

Many hypermonoids satisfy the extra property:

Property P. $a, b \in a \boxplus b$ whenever $a \boxplus b$ is not a singleton.

A **hyperinverse** of an element a in a hypermonoid $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ is an element denoted as $-a$, for which $\mathbb{0} \in a \boxplus (-a)$.

A **hyperzero** of a hypermonoid $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ is an element of the form $a \boxplus (-a) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A)$.

A **hypergroup** is a hypermonoid $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$, satisfying the extra property:

Every element $a \in A$ has a unique hyperinverse.

By [9, §2], any hypergroup satisfies the condition:

(**Reversibility**) If $a \in b \boxplus c$, then $c \in a \boxplus (-b)$.

In [22, Definition 3.1] Viro calls this a **multigroup**.

Definition 1.6. *A **hypermodule** over a monoid $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$ is a hypermonoid $(M, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ together with an action of A on M such that distributivity holds for M over A.*

*A **hyperring** $(A, \cdot, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ is a hypermonoid $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ which also is a hypermodule over $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$.*

In other words, a hyperring is an additive hypermonoid which also is a monoid with respect to an associative multiplication that distributes over addition; we have the two operations $\cdot$ on A and $\boxplus : A \to \tilde{A}$, with distributivity holding on the elements of A.

A **hyperfield** is a hyperring $(A, \cdot, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$, with $(A, \cdot)$ a group.

[12, Definition 2.3] defines a **hypermonoid morphism** to be a map $f : A_1 \to A_2$ of hypergroups, satisfying $f(a \boxplus b) \subseteq f(a) \boxplus f(b)$. This yields the category of hypergroups and their morphisms, which matches the definition of morphism in [19].

Here are some easy instances in which associativity fails in $\mathcal{P}(A)$.

Example 1.7. *Consider the natural max-plus algebra.*

(i) *Define $a \boxplus b = \sup\{a, b\}$, $a \neq b$, and*

$$a \boxplus a = \{0, 9\}.$$

Then each element has a unique hyperinverse, itself, and this is associative on distinct single elements (taking their max) but $(2 \boxplus 2) \boxplus 5 = \{0, 9\} \boxplus 5 = \{5, 9\}$ whereas $2 \boxplus (2 \boxplus 5) = 5$.

(ii) *Define $a \boxplus b = \sup\{a, b\}$, $a \neq b$, and*

$$a \boxplus a = \{-a, 0, a\}.$$

Again each element has a unique hyperinverse, itself, and now

$$(2 \boxplus 3) \boxplus 3 = 3 \boxplus 3 = \{-3, 0, 3\};$$

$$2 \boxplus (3 \boxplus 3) = 2 \boxplus \{-3, 0, 3\} = \{2, 2, 3\}.$$

Lemma 1.8. *If $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1})$ is a monoid and $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$ is a hypermonoid, then A acts on $\tilde{A}$ via the action*

$$aS = \{as : s \in S\}. \tag{1.3}$$

.

Proof. $(a_1 a_2)S = \{(a_1 a_2)s : s \in S\} = \{a_1(a_2 s) : s \in S\} = a_1(a_2 S)$.

□

1.4. **The power set of a hyperfield.**

To proceed further, we need associativity at the level of sets, and we need the following definition to make this precise (and hopefully more manageable, since then we can do all the calculations in the power set).

Definition 1.9. *Every operator ω on A is extended to an **element-compatible** operator on $\mathcal{P}(A)$, in the sense that*

$$\omega_m(S_1, \dots, S_m) = \bigcup \{\omega_m(s_1, \dots, s_m) : s_k \in S_k,\ 1 \leq k \leq m\}. \tag{1.4}$$

If $(A, \boxplus, 0)$ is a hypermonoid, then $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is a monoid with respect to a commutative associative binary operation $\mathcal{P}(A) \times \mathcal{P}(A) \to \mathcal{P}(A)$, compatible with the operation on singletons, in the sense that

$$S_1 \boxplus S_2 = \bigcup \{\{s_1\} \boxplus \{s_2\} : s_i \in S_i\} \tag{1.5}$$

$\tilde{A}$ is the subset of $\mathcal{P}(A)$ containing all singletons and their sums. ($\{\mathbb{0}\}$ is the neutral element.)

Lemma 1.10. *For any multiplicative monoid A, any invertible element of $\mathcal{P}(A)$ must be a singleton.*

Proof. If S has two elements s_1, s_2 and is invertible, then S^{-1} contains ${s_1}^{-1}$ and ${s_2}^{-1}$, implying $1 = {s_1}^{-1}s_2$, i.e., $s_1 = s_2$. □

Theorem 1.4 generalizes easily to:

Theorem 1.11. *Given a hyperfield $(A, \boxplus, \mathbb{0})$, we can define addition elementwise on $\mathcal{P}(A)$ by means of (1.5). Then $(\mathcal{P}(A), \boxplus)$ is a monoid, whose identity element is $\{\mathbb{0}\}$. In this case $A \setminus \{\mathbb{0}\}$ (viewed as the set of singletons) is the set of invertible elements of $\mathcal{P}(A)$.*

Proof. We need to verify associativity, repeating the proof of Theorem 1.4, replacing $+$ by $\boxplus$.

$$\begin{aligned}(S_1 \boxplus S_2) \boxplus S_3 &= \bigcup\{s_1 \boxplus s_2 : s_j \in S_j\} \boxplus S_3 \\ &= \bigcup((s_1 \boxplus s_2) \boxplus s_3) : s_j \in S_j\} \\ &= \bigcup(s_1 \boxplus (s_2 \boxplus s_3)) : s_j \in S_j\} \\ &= S_1 \boxplus \bigcup\{s_2 \boxplus s_3 : s_j \in S_j\} \\ &= S_1 \boxplus (S_2 \boxplus S_3).\end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

The set of invertible elements of $\mathcal{P}(A)$ must be contained in the set of singletons of $\mathcal{P}(A)$, which is A. □

For any finite set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\} \subset \mathcal{P}(A)$, we write $\boxplus S$ for $s_1 \boxplus \cdots \boxplus s_m$, which makes sense since we already have associativity of $\boxplus$.

Remark 1.12. *Viro showed that the general transition of universal relations to $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is not as straightforward as it may seem. The analogous argument to Theorem 1.11 unravels for hyperrings, since distributivity does not pass from elements to sets:*

(i) [22, Theorem 4.B] *$(a \boxplus b)(c \boxplus d) \subseteq (ac) \boxplus (ad) \boxplus (bc) \boxplus (bd)$ in any hyperring; the same argument shows that $(\boxplus S)(\boxplus T) \subseteq \boxplus(ST)$ for any finite sets S, T;*

(ii) [22, Theorem 5.B] *Recall Viro's "triangle" hyperfield, defined over $\mathbb{R}^+$ by the formula*

$$a \boxplus b = \{c \in \mathbb{R}^+ : |a - b| \leq c \leq a + b\}.$$

In other words, $c \in a \boxplus b$ iff there exists an Euclidean triangle with sides of lengths a, b, and c. The "triangle" hyperfield R does not satisfy "double distributivity," so $\mathcal{P}(R)$ is not distributive.

In other words, the analog of Theorem 1.4 fails for distributivity. To overcome this setback, we need to modify our underlying algebraic structure both at the hyper level and the power set level, the crux of the matter being to weaken generalized distributivity on sets.

Actually, many of the important examples of hyperfields are doubly distributive, so we could pass to (distributive) power semirings without further ado. But even in the absence of doubly distributivity, we can formulate the weaker theory in terms of universal algebra, in order to have those techniques at our disposal. On the face of it, this is problematic since the hypersum set could be arbitrarily large. However, we can get around this by focusing on the monoid of singletons, and using operators instead of elements.

1.5. **Pre-semirings.** Motivated by the fact that a hyperring is a multiplicative monoid, we bring in the following definition, keeping the power set in mind:

Definition 1.13. *A **pre-semiring**† is a set $(A, +, \cdot, \mathbb{1}_R)$ for which $(A, +)$ is an additive Abelian semigroup and $(A, \cdot, \mathbb{1}_R)$ is a multiplicative monoid but not necessarily satisfying the usual distributive laws.*

*Given a pre-semiring† A and a (distinguished) multiplicative submonoid $\mathcal{T}$, an $(A, \mathcal{T})$-**module** is a premodule over A that also satisfies the distributivity conditions for $r_i \in \mathcal{T}$ and $a_i \in M$:*

(i) $(r_1 + r_2)a = r_1a + r_2a$,

(ii) $r(a_1 + a_2) = ra_1 + ra_2$,

In line with [11], we call $\mathcal{T}$ **tangible**. When these conditions hold for A, we then call $(A, \mathcal{T})$ a **$\mathcal{T}$-semiring**†.

This can be described in the framework of universal algebra, with elaboration and details given in [19, § 5]. We define the left multiplication maps $\ell_r : M \to M$ by $\ell_r(a) = ra$, a unary operator for each $r \in \mathcal{T}$, and rewrite these rules as the identical relations

(i) $\ell_{r_1+r_2}(x) = \ell_{r_1}(x) + \ell_{r_2}(x)$,
(ii) $\ell_r(x_1 + x_2) = \ell_r(x_1) + \ell_r(x_2)$

Example 1.14. *For any hyperring $\mathcal{T}$, taking $P(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{T})$ is a $\mathcal{T}$-semiring[†].*

1.5.1. *The categorical approach.*

We can improve these results slightly by working in a category with a weaker definition of morphism.

Definition 1.15. *Multiplication **weakly distributes** over addition in a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ if for all finite $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ we have*

$$(\boxplus S)(\boxplus T) \subseteq \boxplus(ST). \tag{1.7}$$

*In this case we call $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ a **weak power semiring**. (It is not a semiring.)*

The restriction of this definition to hyperrings is:

Definition 1.16. *Suppose $(\mathcal{T}, \cdot)$ is a monoid and $(\mathcal{T}, \boxplus)$ a hypermonoid. Multiplication **weakly distributes** over $\boxplus$ in $\mathcal{T}$ if for all $a_i, b \in \mathcal{T}$ we have*

$$(\boxplus_i a_i)b \subseteq \boxplus_i(a_i b). \tag{1.8}$$

*In this case we call $\mathcal{T}$ a **weak hyperring**.*

Proposition 1.17. *Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ is a hyperring. Then multiplication weakly distributes over $\boxplus$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$.*

Proof. We need to verify (1.7). But writing $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ we have

$$(\boxplus S)(\boxplus T) = \bigcup_i (\boxplus s_i)T = \bigcup_i \boxplus(s_i T) \subseteq \boxplus(ST)$$

since each $s_i T \subseteq \boxplus ST$. □

The reverse inclusion fails since we simultaneously encounter varying $s_i T$ when i varies. Thus, we are interested in weak power semirings which, strictly speaking, are not quite semirings. So far, the power set of a hyperring is a weak power semiring. Now we repeat the proof of [22, Theorem 4.B], to show that at the bottom level we have not lost anything.

Theorem 1.18. *Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ is a weak hyperring. If $(\mathcal{T}, \cdot)$ also is a group, then $\mathcal{T}$ is a hyperring, which can be identified with the set of singletons of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$.*

Proof. As in [22, Theorem 4.A], to obtain distributivity, we need to reverse the inequality (1.7) when $S = \{a\}$ is a singleton $\{a\}$, given multiplicative inverses in $\mathcal{T}$. But

$$\boxplus(aT) = aa^{-1}(\boxplus(aT)) \subseteq a(\boxplus a^{-1}aT) = a \boxplus T.$$

□

Thus, the theory of hyperfields embeds into the theory of weak power semirings.

Definition 1.19. *A **weak morphism** of weak power semirings is a multiplicative homomorphism $f : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}_1) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}_2)$, satisfying*

$$f(S_1 \boxplus S_2) \subseteq f(S_1) \boxplus f(S_2).$$

By induction, we have $f(\boxplus S) \subseteq \boxplus f(S)$ for any finite set S, and thus for arbitrary S. This is described in universal algebra in [19, Definition 5.4]. Note that the multiplicative version yields equality, since if $f(\{a\})f(\{b\}) \subseteq f(\{ab\})$, then $f(\{a\})f(\{b\}) = f(\{ab\})$ since they are both singletons, so $f(a)f(b) = f(ab)$.

1.6. **Weak power modules.**

As often is the case, one gets a deeper understanding by turning to modules. This was done in [3, Definition 2.18], but we take a slightly weaker definition in line with our earlier categorical considerations.

Definition 1.20. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ is a weak power semiring. A **weak module** over $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ is a set M with an element $\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}}$ such that $(\mathcal{P}(M), \boxplus_M, \mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}})$ is a monoid with scalar multiplication $\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathcal{P}(M)$ satisfying the following for all $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $T \subseteq M$:*

(i) $(S_1S_2)T = S_1(S_2T)$;
(ii) $(\boxplus_{\mathcal{T}} S)(\boxplus_M T) \subseteq \boxplus(ST)$;
(iii) $r\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}} = \mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}}$ *for all* r *in* $\mathcal{T}$;
(iv) $\mathbb{0}_R a = \mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}}$, $\forall a \in M$.

This leads to a slight modification for hypermodules:

Definition 1.21. *A **weak hypermodule** over a weak hyperring $(R, \boxplus_R, \mathbb{0}_R)$ is a hypergroup $(M, \boxplus_M, \mathbb{0})$ together with a binary operation $R \times M \to \mathcal{P}(M)$ satisfying the following properties for all $r, r_i \in R$ and $a, a_j \in M$:*

(i) $(r_1r_2)a = r_1(r_2a)$;
(ii) $(\boxplus_i r_i)(\boxplus_j a_j) \subseteq \boxplus_{i,j}(r_i a_j)$;
(iii) $r\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}} = \mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}}$;
(iv) $\mathbb{0}_R a = \mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{M}}$.

As before, $\{\boxplus S : \text{ finite } S \subseteq M\}$ is a submodule of $\mathcal{P}(M)$.

Definition 1.22. *A **weak module morphism** is a map $f : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathcal{P}(N)$ of weak modules, satisfying*

$$f(rS_1) \subseteq rf(S_1);$$
$$f(S_1 \boxplus S_2) \subseteq f(S_1) \boxplus f(S_2), \quad \forall S_i \subseteq M.$$

The weak module morphism is an example of a morphism as given in [19].

Theorem 1.23. *Suppose $\mathcal{P}(R)$ is a weak power semiring and $(R, \cdot)$ also is a group. If M is a weak module over $\mathcal{P}(R)$, then M is an R-module.*

Proof. We repeat the proof of Theorem 1.18. First we show that $f(rS) = rf(S)$, i.e., $rf(s) = f(rs) \in f(rS)$. for all $r \in R$ and $s \in S$. Indeed,

$$rf(s) = rf(r^{-1}rs) \subseteq rr^{-1}f(rs) = f(rs).$$

To obtain distributivity, we need to reverse the inclusion (1.7), given multiplicative inverses in R. Taking $S = \{a\}$ to be a singleton, we are given

$$\boxplus(aT) = aa^{-1}(\boxplus(aT)) \subseteq a(\boxplus(a^{-1}aT)) = a \boxplus T.$$

□

Taking f to be left multiplication by an element $a \in R$, we have $a(\boxplus S) \subseteq \boxplus(aS)$ which is precisely weak distributivity. In other words, M is weakly distributive over R iff left multiplication is a weak module morphism, for every element $r \in R$. When $(R, \cdot)$ is a group, M is distributive over R.

1.6.1. *Negation maps.*

We also want to treat negation maps from [19, §4] in this perspective. We review the definition.

Definition 1.24. *A **negation map** on an additive semigroup $(A, +)$ is a semigroup homomorphism $(-) : A \to A$ of order ≤ 2, again written $a \mapsto (-)a$.*

(Thus $(-)(a + b) = (-)a + (-)b$.) For all other operators, including multiplication, we have a different perspective:

Definition 1.25. *A **negation map** $(-) : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ on an operator $\omega_{m,j}$ (other than addition) satisfies*

$$(-)\omega_{m,j}(a_1, \ldots, a_{u-1}, a_u, a_{u+1}, \ldots, a_m) = \omega_{m,j}(a_1, \ldots, a_{u-1}, (-)a_u, a_{u+1}, \ldots, a_m) \tag{1.9}$$

for each $a_u \in \mathcal{A}_u$, $1 \leq u \leq m$.

Lemma 1.26. *Any negation map on $\mathcal{A}$ induces a negation map on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, via $(-)S = \{(-)s : s \in S\}$.*

Proof. A special case of Theorem 1.4(ii), viewing the properties of the negation map as identical relations. To see that $(-)(a_1 + a_2) = (-)a_1(-)a_2$, note that $0 \in a_i(-)a_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, so

$$0 \in a_1(-)a_1 + a_2(-)a_2 = (a_1 + a_2)(-)a_1(-)a_2.$$

Likewise, $0 \in a_1(-)a_1$ implies $0 \in a(a_1(-)a_1) \in aa_1(-)aa_1$. □

When $\mathcal{T}$ is a hyperfield, $(A, \mathcal{T})$ is a $\mathcal{T}$-semiring† with the negation map $a \mapsto (-)a$. In this way we have embedded the theory of hyperfields into the theory of $\mathcal{T}$-semirings† with a negation map. This is pushed even further in [19, §7.9].

1.7. **Major examples.**

Let us see how all of this applies to the major examples of [3]. Since these examples are so important, we will pay special attention to the set $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ corresponding to a hyperring $\mathcal{T}$. Although the theory presented above formally passes to the weak power semiring $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$, one actually gets distributivity in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ when the underlying hyperring satisfies generalized distributivity, which happens in many of the examples. Even better, we can often identify $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ with a semiring which we already recognize.

Many of the "good" examples can be put in the framework of [3, Remark 2.7].

Example 1.27. *Let R be a commutative semiring. Any multiplicative monoid $\mathcal{T}$, together with a surjection of multiplicative monoids $\varphi : R \to \mathcal{T}$, has an induced hyperring structure given by the hyperaddition law*

$$a_1 \boxplus a_2 := \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(a_1) + \varphi^{-1}(a_2)).$$

This extends naturally to $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$, via

$$S_1 \boxplus S_2 := \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(S_1) + \varphi^{-1}(S_2)).$$

Generalized distributivity on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ and thus on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, is inherited from generalized distributivity on $\mathcal{P}(R)$. Explicitly, for $a_i \in S$ and $b_j \in T$, we have

$$(\boxplus_i a_i)(\boxplus_j b_j) = \sum_i \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(a_i)) \sum_j \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(b_j)) = \sum_{i,j} \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(a_i)\varphi^{-1}(b_j)) = \sum_{i,j} \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(a_i b_j)) \subseteq \boxplus(ST), \tag{1.10}$$

yielding $\boxplus S \boxplus T \subseteq \boxplus(ST)$. For the opposite direction, given $\boxplus_{i,j} a_i b_j \in \boxplus(ST)$, we reverse (1.10) to get

$$\sum_{i,j} \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(a_i b_j)) = \sum_i \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(a_i)) \sum_j \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(b_j)) \in (\boxplus S)(\boxplus T).$$

Thus $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ is a semiring, and its theory can be embedded into semiring theory.

The complications arise when Example 1.27 is not applicable, cf. (vii), (viii) of the next example.

Example 1.28.

The tropical hyperfield. Define $\mathbb{R}_\infty = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ and define the product $a \bigodot b := a + b$ and

$$a \boxplus b = \begin{cases} max(a, b) \text{ if } a \neq b, \\ \{c : c \leq a\} \text{ if } a = b. \end{cases}$$

Thus 0 is the multiplicative identity element, $-\infty$ is the additive identity, and we have a hyperfield (satisfying Property P), called the ***tropical hyperfield****.*

Proposition 1.29. *This is easily seen to be isomorphic (as hyperfields) to Izhakian's* ***extended tropical arithmetic*** *[10], further expounded as* ***supertropical algebra*** *in [11], where we identify $(-\infty, a] := \{c : c \leq a\}$ with a^ν, so we have a natural hyperfield isomorphism of this tropical hyperfield with the sub-semiring $\widehat{\mathbb{R}_\infty}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}_\infty)$, because*

$$(-\infty, a] + b = \begin{cases} b : b > a; \\ (-\infty, a] : b = a \\ (-\infty, b] \cup (b, a] = (-\infty, a] : b < a. \end{cases}$$

This isomorphism is as semirings. Thus Example 1.27 is applicable.

Example 1.30. *The Krasner hyperfield. Let $K = \{0; 1\}$ with the usual operations of Boolean algebra, except that now $1 \boxplus 1 = \{0; 1\}$. The Krasner hyperfield satisfies Property P. Again, this generates a subsemiring of $\mathcal{P}(K)$ having three elements, and is just the supertropical algebra of the monoid K, where we identify $\{0; 1\}$ with 1^ν. Example 1.27 is applicable.*

Example 1.31. *Valuative hyperfields (*[3, Example 2.12]*) also are isomorphic to the extended semirings in the sense of* [11]*, in the same way.*

Example 1.32. *(Hyperfield of signs) Let $S := \{0, 1, -1\}$ with the usual multiplication law and hyperaddition defined by $1 \boxplus 1 = \{1\}$, $-1 \boxplus -1 = \{-1\}$, $x \boxplus 0 = 0 \boxplus x = \{x\}$, and $1 \boxplus -1 = -1 \boxplus 1 = \{0, 1, -1\}$. Then S is a hyperfield (satisfying Property P), called the hyperfield of signs.*

In this case, though, we have a natural interpretation for $\mathcal{P}(S)$:

(i) $\{+1\}$ *means "positive," denoted as* $>_0$.
(ii) $\{-1\}$ *means "negative," denoted as* $<_0$.
(iii) $\{0\}$ *means "neutral."*
(iv) $\{0, +1\}$ *means "non-negative," denoted as* $\geq_0$.
(v) $\{0, -1\}$ *means "non-positive," denoted as* $\leq_0$.
(vi) $S = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ *means "could be anything"*
(Note that we have not denoted $\{-1, +1\}$.)

Then we have the familiar identifications:

(i) $>_0 + 0 = >_0 + \geq_0 = >_0 + >_0 = >_0$;
(ii) $\geq_0 + 0 = \geq_0 + \geq_0 = \geq_0$;
(iii) $0 + 0 = 0$;
(iv) $\leq_0 + 0 = \leq_0 + \leq_0 = \leq_0$;
(v) $<_0 + 0 = <_0 + \leq_0 = <_0 + <_0 = <_0$;
(vi) $>_0 + <_0 = \geq_0 + <_0 = >_0 + \leq_0 = \geq_0 + \leq_0 = S + <_0 = S + 0 = S + >_0 = S + \leq_0 = S + \geq_0 = S$.
These six elements constitute the sub-semiring $\tilde{S}$ of $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Example 1.33. *The "triangle" hyperfield A of Remark 1.12 is not doubly distributive but does satisfy Property P since $|a - b| \leq a \leq a + b$. Here $\tilde{A} = \{[a_1, a_2] : a_1 \leq a_2\}$ since $[a_1, a_2] = \frac{a_1+a_2}{2} + \frac{a_2-a_1}{2} \in \tilde{A}$. Any interval $[0, b]$ is in $\mathcal{P}(A)^\circ$, since $[0, b] = [0, \frac{b}{2}] + [0, \frac{b}{2}]$.*

Example 1.34. *The phase hyperfield. Let S^1 denote the complex unit circle, and $P := S^1 \cup \{0\}$. We say that points a and b are antipodes if $a = -b$. Multiplication is defined as usual (so corresponds on S^1 to addition of angles). We call an arc of less than 180 degrees* ***short****. The hypersum is given by*

$$a \boxplus b = \begin{cases} \text{all points in the short arc from } a \text{ to } b \text{ if } a \neq b; \\ \{-a, 0, a\} \text{ if } a, b \text{ are antipodes;} \\ \{a\} \text{ if } b = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then P is a hyperfield (satisfying Property P), called the ***phase hyperfield****. At the power set level, given $T_1, T_2 \subseteq S^1$, one of which having at least two points, we define $T_1 \boxplus T_2$ to be the union of all (short) arcs from a point of T_1 to a non-antipodal point in T_2 (which together makes a connected arc), together with $\{0\}$ if T_2 contains an antipode of T_1. Note that any arc of S^1 can be obtained by taking T_1 to be a single point in the middle and T_2 to be the two endpoints.*

In other words, $\widetilde{S^1}$ of $\mathcal{P}(S^1)$ is the set of short arcs, possibly with $\{0\}$ adjoined. This is not a subsemiringl for this we need the set of all arcs, where $\boxplus$ is concatenation (and filling in the rest of S^1 if the arcs go more than half way around), and adjoining $\{0\}$ if the arcs contain an antipode.

Double distributivity fails, when we take a_1 and a_2 almost to be antipodes, $b_1 = a_2$, and the arc connecting b_1 and b_2 just passes the antipode of a_1; then $(a_1 \boxplus a_2)(b_1 \boxplus b_2)$ is the arc from a_1 to b_2, a little more than a semicircle, whereas $a_1b_1 \boxplus a_1b_2 \boxplus a_2b_2$ is already all of S^1.

Viro [22] *also has a somewhat different version, which is not distributive.*

Example 1.35. *Here is another example, suggested by Lopez, also cf.* [13]. *Consider* $\mathbb{R}$*, with addition given by* $a \boxplus b$ *and* $b \boxplus a$ *(for* $a \leq b$*) to be the interval* $[a, b]$*. This extends to addition on intervals, given by* $[a_1, b_2] + [a_2, b_2] = \{\min(a_1, a_2), \max(b_1, b_2)\}$*, which clearly is associative. But the inverse is not unique, since* $a + (-a) = [-a, a]$ *contains 0, but so does* $\frac{a}{2} + a$*. On the other hand, this does satisfy the restriction that every set of the form* $a + (-a)$ *cannot be of the form* $a + (-b)$ *for* $b \neq a$*, so if we modify the condition of quasi-inverse to stipulate that* $a + (-a)$ *must be of the form* $c + (-c)$ *for some* c*, then it is unique. This is essentially the general condition set forth in* [19].

References

[1] M. Akian, S. Gaubert, and A. Guterman. Linear independence over tropical semirings and beyond. In *Tropical and Idempotent Mathematics*, G.L. Litvinov and S.N. Sergeev, (eds.), *Contemp. Math.*, 495:1–38, 2009.

[2] M. Akian, S. Gaubert, and A. Guterman. Tropical Cramer determinants revisited. In Tropical and idempotent mathematics and applications, Contemp. Math. 616, 1–45. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2014.

[3] M. Baker. Matroids over hyperfields, arXiv:1601.01204v2 [math.CO], 2016.

[4] G. Blachar and L. Rowen Symmetrized rank of matrices

[5] A. Connes and C. Consani, From monoids to hyperstructures: in search of an absolute arithmetic. In *Casimir Force, Casimir operators, and the Riemann hypothesis*,, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 147–198, 2010.

[6] S. Gaubert, *Théorie des systèmes linéaires dans les dioïdes*. PhD dissertation, School of Mines. Paris, July 1992.

[7] J. Golan, *Semirings and their Applications*, Springer-Science + Business, Dordrecht, 1999. (Previously published by Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1999.)

[8] M. Gondran and M. Minoux. Graphs, dioids and semirings, volume 41 of Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces Series. Springer, New York, 2008.

[9] Henry

[10] Z. Izhakian. Tropical arithmetic and matrix algebra. *Comm. in Algebra* 37(4):1445–1468, 2009.

[11] Z. Izhakian and L. Rowen. Supertropical algebra. *Adv. in Math.*, 225(4):2222–2286, 2010, Preprint at arXiv:0806.1175, 2007.

[12] J. Jaiung, Algebraic geometry over hyperrings. Preprint. Available at arxiv:math.AG/1512.04837, 37 pages, 2015.

[13] M. Gómez, S. López-Permouth , F. Mazariegos, A.J. Vargas De León, and R.Z. Cifuentes, Group Structures on Families of Subsets of a Group, arXiv:1604.01119 [math.GR], 2015.

[14] A. Niv. On pseudo-inverses of matrices and their characteristic polynomials in supertropical algebra, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 471: 264–290, 2015.

[15] A. Niv. Factorization of tropical matrices, *J. Algebra Appl.*, 13(1):1350066:1–26, 2014.

[16] M. Plus. Linear systems in (max; +)-algebra. In Proceedings of the 29th Conference on Decision and Control, Honolulu, Dec. 1990.

[17] C. Reutenauer and H. Straubing, *Inversion of matrices over a commutative semiring*, J. Algebra, **88**, 350-360, 1984.

[18] L.H. Rowen. *Graduate algebra: A noncommutative view Semigroups and Combinatorial Applications*. American Mathematical Society, 2008.

[19] L.H. Rowen. *Algebras with a negation map*, originally entitled *Symmetries in tropical algebra*, arXiv:1602.00353 [math.RA], 2016.

[20] D.E. Rutherford. Inverses of Boolean matrices, Proceedings of the Glasgow Mathematical Association 6 (1963), 49–53.

[21] H. Straubing. A combinatorial proof of the Cayley-Hamilton theorem. Discrete Math., 43(2-3):273-279, 1983.

[22] O.Y. Viro. Hyperfields for Tropcial Geometry I. Hyperfields and dequantization. ArXiv AG/1006.3034, 2010.

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel

E-mail address: rowen@math.biu.ac.il